

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 21 2006

REMARKS

Claim 9 has been cancelled. Thus, Claims 1-8 and 10-11 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claim 1 has been amended.

Claim 1 was amended to correct typographical errors, and no new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

The phrase "fictionally engaged" in Claim 1 has now been amended to "frictionally engaging." Claim 9 has been cancelled. Thus, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Seidner* (US 2,207,445) in view of *Stanley* (US 5,881,839). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 now recites "a stabilization frame located in proximity to said lower ends of said front and back frames, wherein said stabilization frame is constructed to provide stability for said fishing chair by frictionally engaging said stabilization frame with granular materials when said fishing chair is placed on said granular materials." On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed stabilization frame was disclosed by *Seidner* as shores 4 and/or bars 43. However, *Seidner* does not teach or suggest that shores 4 and/or bars 43 can provide stability for the platform ladder in Figure 1 by frictionally engaging shores 4 and/or bars 43 with granular materials on which the platform ladder is placed.

RECT AVAILABLE COPY

Claim 2 recites "said stabilization frame includes steps having a "┐" cross-section." As shown in Figure 3, the cross-sectional shapes of *Seidner's* rung plates 17 and 23 are in rectangular shape instead of ┐-shaped, as recited. More importantly, since the Examiner had characterized *Seidner's* shores 4 and/or bars 43 as the claimed stabilization frame; thus, the cross-sectional shapes of rung plates 17 and 23 are really not applicable.

Stanley does not teach or suggest the claimed stabilization either. Because the cited references, whether considered separately or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

In addition, since Claim 11 was not rejected, Claim 11 is believed to be allowable.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-8 and 10-11 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Dillon & Yudell Deposit Account No. 50-3083.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy, suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS